

REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the addition of new claims 16 to 31, claims 1 to 31 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper and cited references.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 10 and 14-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1 to 4, 10 and 14 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0166834 ("Omar"). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 to 4, 10 and 14 to 15 are not anticipated by Omar for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 relates to a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement to at least one handheld wireless device that receives data from a wireless carrier network. Claim 1 as presented recites that the system includes a relay arrangement for routing the data for transmission over the wireless carrier network, and a firewall arrangement that provides security for the data, the server arrangement, and the relay arrangement. Claim 1 further recites that the relay arrangement is arranged **behind the firewall arrangement**.

In stark contrast to the foregoing, the system described by Omar does not include a relay arrangement for routing data for transmission over a wireless carrier network, in which the relay arrangement is arranged behind a firewall arrangement, as recited in claim 1. Rather in Omar, as can be readily seen, for example, in Figure 11, the gateway 15 is arranged outside the security firewall. That is, the gateway 15, which provides an interface between the wireless network 14 and the wide area network (WAN) 16, is arranged outside of the security firewall and therefore unsecured by the firewall. As such, Omar does not disclose, or even suggest, a relay arrangement as recited in claim 1.

As regards to claims 2 to 4, which ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Omar does not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the same reasons given above in support of the patentability of claim 1.

As regards to claims 10 and 14, it is respectfully submitted that Omar does not anticipate claims 10 and 14 for at least the same reasons given above in support of the patentability of claim 1.

Independent claim 15 recites a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement to at least one handheld wireless device that receives data from a wireless carrier network, in which a relay arrangement for routing the data for transmission is arranged within a controlled network. As more fully set forth above, the gateway 15 described by Omar is arranged outside of the security firewall. Accordingly, the gateway 15 is not arranged within a controlled network as recited in claim 15. Indeed, the gateway 15 interfaces directly with the WAN 16. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Omar does not anticipate claim 15.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 5 to 9 and 11 to 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5 to 9 and 11 to 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Omar and U.S. Patent No. 2004/0022237 ("Elliot"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Omar and Elliot does not render unpatentable claims 5 to 9 and 11 to 13 for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5 to 9 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 1. Claims 11 to 13 depend from claim 10 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 10. As more fully set forth above, Omar does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 1 or claim 10. Elliot is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features recited in claim 1 or claim 10 not disclosed or suggested by Omar. Indeed, Elliot does not disclose, or even suggest, the features recited in claim 1 or claim 10 not disclosed or suggested by Omar. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Omar and Elliot does not render unpatentable claims 5 to 9 or claims 11 to 13.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. New Claims 16 to 31

New claims 16 to 31 have been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 16 to 31 add no new matter and are fully supported by the present application, including the Specification.

Since claims 16 to 19, 22, 28, 29 and 31 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable over the references relied upon for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 1.

Since claims 20 and 27 depend from claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that claims 20 and 27 are patentable over the references relied upon for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 10.

Since claims 21 and 30 depend from claim 14, it is respectfully submitted that claims 21 and 30 are patentable over the references relied upon for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 14.

Since claim 23 depends from claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 is patentable over the references relied upon for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 15.

As regards claims 24 to 26, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable over the references relied upon for at least the same reasons given above in support of the patentability claim 1.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 19, 2005

By: Michael P. Paul

Michael P. Paul (Reg. No. 53,443)
KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646